DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 087 EA 012 283

AUTHOR Burlingame, Martin
TITLE Coordination, Control and Facilitation of Instruction Within Schools.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 78
NOTE 50p.: Prepared for the School Organization and Effects Conference (San Diego, CA, January 27-29, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Characteristics: Administrator Responsibility: Administrator Role: Cooperative Teaching: Educational Administration: Elementary Secondary Education: Institutional Characteristics: *School Role: Teacher Administrator Relationship: Teacher Discipline

ABSTRACT

Dismissing common metaphors for the school such as the "knowledge factory" or the "cure for the disease of ignorance," the author makes preliminary observations leading toward some sort of new metaphor that would better describe the school as a collection of autonomous and self-regulated individuals. He presents what he calls four "notions" that might generate researchable problems linking these notions to coordination, control, and facilitation of instruction in schools. The first notion concerns the official and private "secrets" that school administrators are privy to because of their unique positions. The second notion revolves around the "seasons" or the repeated, unvarying progression of events in schools that provides regularity and shared rituals. The third notion examined is that of "administrative morality," which the author defines as the "use of secrets to good ends." The final notion is that of administrator "coldness," or the distance that administrators must maintain from others. The author closes by tying these notions to the concepts of school governance, vertical coordination, and horizontal coordination. (JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

DEC 3 - 1979

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED180087

COORDINATION, CONTROL AND FACILITATION OF INSTRUCTION WITHIN SCHOOLS

Martin Burlingame

Department of Administration, Higher and Continuing Education

College of Education
University of Illinois at Urbana - Champaign

Prepared for the School Organization and Effects Conference
The Productivity Division
The National Institute of Education
San Diego, California
January 27 - 29, 1978

EA 012 283

The whole doctrine that we must adjust ourselves to our environment, which I take to be the prevailing doctrine of American education, seems to me radically erroneous. Our mission here on earth is to change our environment, not to adjust ourselves to it. If we become maladjusted in the process, so much the worse for the environment.

Robert Maynard Hutchins
Farewell Address to the Students
February 2, 1951

I find it uncomfortable, but not surprising, to be charged to be authoritatively visionary in this paper. The NIE staff has labored long and hard to produce a conference agenda capable of establishing new directions for research and development. They have not shirked or skirted tough issues, have gathered top-notch scholars, and have charged those who write "to produce or introduce new paradigms or syntheses for research." Their Teutonic tone suggests that failure to accomplish these robust tasks will result not only in failure to receive traveling money, but also some form of intellectual drumming out of the corps. I see a scene, like those relished by old Hollywood directors, where instead of having symbols of rank ripped from my shoulders, the conveners will rip my 3 x 5 cards in half, or at least use the title page of this paper to start a fire in their company fireplaces.

What troubles me more than strident demands to produce insights on command is the very familiarity of this command. The charge echoes many sentiments currently voiced about the needs of American education. These sentiments, summed hastily, are that American education is unresponsive to the desires of all but a few of our children and their parents. Those who are different, be in color, physical ability, mental ability or sex, are not well served by the schools. And, those few who are serviced are happy accidents--the joyous results of happenstance, not planning. Teachers and administrators of American schools are petty bureaucrats, content with maintaining order in an enterprise they do not understand, cherishing neatness above creativity, order over understanding, and mindlessness to intellectual quest. Somehow this morass needs ordering, in some way screws which have come loose need tightening, as these failings of the past are exorcised. If only some command on high would be given, and if only obedience by educators followed, then some new day for American schooling would dawn. What we lack today is someone with the courage to shout "Halt" and to then give the needed new command.

This paper strikes a posture of insubordination; it is in deliberate contrast to the intellectual marching orders which dominate so much of American education and the tenor of this conference. This deviancy takes several forms.

First, this paper is written in what Kelly (1964) labeled the invitational mood. Speaking particularly of verbs, Kelly suggested that:

> . . . a verb could be cast in a form which would suggest to the listener that a certain novel interpretation of an object might be entertained. For example, I might say, "Suppose we regard the floor as if it were hard."
>
> If I make such a statement I immediately find myself in an interesting position. The statement leaves both the speaker and the listener, not with a conclusion on their hands, but in a posture of expectancy--suppose we do regard the floor as if it were hard, what then? A verb employed in the invitational mood, assuming our language had such a mood, would have the effect of orienting one to the future, not merely to the present or to the past. It suggests that the floor is open to a variety of interpretations or constructions. It invites the listener to cope with his circumstances--in this case the floor--in new ways. But more than this, it suggests that the view of the floor as something hard is one that is not imposed upon us from without, nor is it isolated from external evidence, as a phenomenological proposition would be, but is one that can be pursued, tested, abandoned, or reconsidered at a later time. "Suppose we regard the floor as if if were hard; what follows and what do we do about it?" (pp. 138-139)

Readers will not be misguided if they read all parts of this paper as Kelly saw verbs and if they replace Kelly's floor with Burlingame's school.

Second, these invitational musings will deliberately avoid the three most common paradigms used today in studying school administration--traditional role theory, systems theory (Burlingame, in press) and contingency theory. Ducking these currently popular themes suggests my avid commitment to the charge of being prophetic. I fully anticipate that the next few years will see an ever-growing body of literature working out these heuristic pastures. Most heavily grazed will be the works of those interested in contingency theory. I shall leave the cataloging, revising and elaborating of these areas to others.

Third, since I have forsaken the traditional review of the literature, what has influenced my reflections? One powerful source has been my sporadic

efforts at reflections about being an administrator for the last four years. Other influences over these musings were in part reading again the works of symbolic interaction thinkers, visiting with colleagues at Urbana working on NSF case studies in science education and looking at current works on curriculum (Fullan & Pomfret, 1977; Haller, 1970; Walker, 1977). These sources suggested that I pay close attention to the ways that teachers viewed their work and stressed the commonplaces of life in schools.

Fourth, this paper requires active involvement of the reader. Not only is it written in the invitational mood, it also has single spaced inserts, a catalog or menu mentality and an unwillingness to be neat and tidy about some ideas. The inserts, for instance, are designed not only to provide some evidence on the point under discussion but also to invite the reader to actively debate and re-interpret the discussion. Some may wish to replace generic names such as "principal" or "teacher" with some of their favorite examples, such as "Mr. Brown" or "Mrs. Dunlop." These inserts set among a number of ideas; ideas not yet polished or codified. Often the paper seems to resemble a catalog or menu, inviting the reader's attention and selection. Finally, readers will note that certain sections seem to stress group activities while the next centers on individuals. I have not attempted in this paper to remedy these inconsistencies, and am painfully aware of many of them.

Fifth, this paper ignores completely the nature of and the linkages between the environment and the school. Such an omission is deliberate, and regretable. I can only plead that in this instance I was following orders.

The work in this paper, hence, is in an invitational mood reflecting my conscious decision to seek different ways of attacking problems concerning coordination, control and facilitation of instruction within schools. My personal sense is that readers may profit from working through this paper if they view it as part of some evolutionary stage best described as predating

the first Ice Age, if not the third day of Creation. While written in the declarative mood, this paper is correctly read as hypothetical, cluttered, inconsistent and slightly off-beat and out-of-key.

This exercise of intemperance begins with a brief section dealing with generative metaphors of the school. The second, and longest section, is divided into four parts. The first part considers problems that administrators face when they consider control. The focus of this first part is on the problems of "secrets." The second part explores the problems of the periodicity of life in schools. For the administrator, schools are creatures of habits. The third part discusses the moral dilemmas of changing the behaviors of subordinates. In this part my interests are on the issues of generations in a school and their references to different ways of judging worth. The fourth, and final part, seeks to explore how administrators view the careers of their employees and charges. Its concern is with administrative coldness and with the administrator as dilettante. The final section of the paper draws some preliminary research notions from these two earlier sections.

GENERATIVE METAPHORS OF THE SCHOOL

This opening section attacks the all too common notion that it is heuristically profitable to think about schools as if they were knowledge factories and begins the quest for more heuristic metaphors for both understanding and changing what happens in schools.

If we either explicitly or implicitly assume that it is fruitful to see the school "as if" it were an industrial enterprise, a knowledge factory, then concepts such as coordination, control and facilitation of instruction processes are ways of overcoming the problems associated with inefficiency. The seminal work exploring the impact of this metaphor of school as factory on educational

administration is Callahan (1962). He suggests that the use of this metaphor has produced tragic consequences.

> The tragedy itself was fourfold: that educational questions were subordinated to business considerations; that a scientific label was put on some very unscientific and dubious methods and practices; and that an anti-intellectual climate, already prevelant, was strengthened. As the business-industrial values and procedures spread into the thinking and acting of educators, countless education decisions were made on economic or on non-educational grounds (pp. 246-247).

If we treat the school "as if" it were a factory, and if costs are increasing (salaries) and profits declining (test scores), then inefficiencies must be eliminated.

As Schön (1977) has pointed out, the ways that individuals frame social problems depends upon the metaphors they use, either explicitly or implicitly, in their analysis of these problems. Just as importantly, Schön continues, these metaphors also set the general directions for problem solving. These "generative metaphors", such as the school as an industrial factory, suggest that the problems and solutions are intimately linked. Hence, if we see schools are in "trouble", and if we use a metaphor which suggests schools are like factories, we may wish to examine the raw inputs to schools, the technological processes involved in creating the product and the response of the market to the product. In this frame, coordination, control and facilitation take on mechanistic attributes. In this metaphor, these concepts suggest that a hierarchy of experts are able to generate standard operating procedures for handling production problems. These concepts also connotate intensive measurings of raw materials, conversion processes and market responses to products.

Cast in another metaphor frame these concepts take on different coloration. Suppose we believe that it is heuristic to see ignorance as a disease and schooling as its cure. Then schools look like another element in the larger family

of "disease/cure" problems and solutions. Some family members include cancer, alcoholism, unwanted pregnancies, and divorce. If we view phenomena "as if" they were diseases, then for each we could propagate cures.

The cures for the disease family of metaphors rest upon notions which stress gaining basic information ("research"), creating new palliatives ("development"), and spreading these remedies so that those in need receive them ("dissemination"). Once we know the etiology of the disease, then we can develop and spread the cure. The drop in standardized achievement test scores is comparable, then, to the number of cases of malaria and yellow fever in the Canal Zone at the turn of the century. Once we know what causes these diseases and how they spread, just as Walter Reed, we can eradicate the mosquitoes and prescribe more powerful drugs. The generative metaphor of disease/cure suggests different meanings for coordination, control and facilitation of instruction than does the factory metaphor.

These two families of metaphors become extremely powerful if they are combined into some metaphor of an "efficient ignorance-curing factory." Perhaps the best illustration of this combined metaphor is the teaching hospital, with tensions existing between costs and research, or laboratory schools linked to university colleges of education. But at this point, I am less concerned about empirical sites and more concerned to point out that the generative metaphors we use in thinking about schools set the content of problems and solutions we generate (Brown, 1976).

What I also wish to suggest is that both the factory and the disease metaphors of schooling are serious flawed. As I and others have argued in detail earlier (Burlingame, in press; Pondy and Mitroff, in press) using some or all of the categories generated by the factory metaphor create serious problems. First, the metaphor ignores the various levels of systems, some of which are not

mechanistic. Second, schools simply do not have technologies which can in any way be viewed as mechanistic. Finally, the factory metaphor accepts many organizationally created categories as if they are meaningful for both description and analysis. Such bureaucratic fictions (Dubin, 1968; Porter, 1973) as pupil-teacher ratio, lesson plans, schedules or teacher evaluations may not be descriptions of what occurs or in any way useful as analytic categories. These fictions may stand in sharp contrast to what goes on in schools (Dreeben, 1970; Mintzberg, 1973).

At this point in time, I am less certain of the heuristic importance of the disease/cure metaphor, although I believe many critics of the early 1970's rejected this metaphor with vehement critiques of the commonality and universality of "schooling" innoculations. The efforts to introduce voucher systems, for instance, were conspicious attempts to replace the notion that schools as doctors gave students as patients what the patient needed. In its place, many suggested that schools were merchants who should compete to give the students as customers what they wanted as customers.

We might be better off thinking metaphorically about schools "as if" they were transportation terminals (airports, train stations, bus depots) or "as if" they were groups of international states seeking to develop trading treaties. The transportation metaphor, for example, highlights the problems of mobility of participants, ambiguity of goals among passengers, guests, agents, vendors, traffic controllers and operators, and regularities introduced by numbers of departure arrangements and schedules. Remedies to problems involving the control, coordination and facilitation of passenger movement (fewer miss their departure) include better announcements, clearer and larger signs giving directions in several languages and pictorially, and training passengers to delays ("we are more on time than our competitors"). Frequent and large displays of time of

departure, re-enforced with several verbal announcements, might also help passengers to leave on time.

The international treaty metaphor highlights issues involving negotiations and bargaining. The problems of tariffs, trade embargoes and international rights can be seen as analogs to trafficking among various student groups, the relations between Miss Jones and her third hour class as opposed to her fifth hour class, or the rights of privacy in student locker areas or teacher's lounges. When problems develop, the solution is getting everybody together to talk out the problem. New treaties are bargained hard because they have important consequences for participants. For example, students often bargain for grades or for privileges in classrooms. Once again, the concepts of coordination, control and facilitation take on sharply different meanings.

What I would like to do at this point is to introduce "the" new metaphor which provides "the" problems and "the" solutions. Unfortunately, I can't. What I can do, nonetheless, is to provide some of the dimensions of the contrast between the all too prevalent factory or disease metaphor and the "new" metaphor. The four notions to be discussed in the next section of the paper may be of help in illuminating some dimensions of the "new" metaphor and its statement of problems/solutions just as "profit/loss" or "drug/cure" enlighten about the factory or curing metaphors.

FOUR NOTIONS

In this section, our attention turns to exploring four notions. These notions--secrets, seasons, morality and distance--are invitational constructs, intent on generating some researchable problems which link these notions to the coordination, control and facilitation of instruction within schools.

1. ADMINISTRATORS AND SECRETS

The loneliness of command--an inevitable situation faced by the local Scout master, Patton, Eisenhower, R.E. Lee, U.S. Grant or the principal of the local school. The stuff of novels, movies, plays, and television is seen as high drama, and as a truism about administration. It may be summed up by a picture of a President walking alone on a beach, or pensively staring out the windows of the Oval Office. It is, as they say, the price of the office.

Few have written sensitively about the facts of administrative isolation, even fewer have puzzled about its meaning for life in organizations (Jackson, 1976-77). In the next few pages I wish to explore two or three facets of the loneliness of command of a school principal.

Principals, like most managers, seek to put themselves at the central point in the communication network of their organizations (Mintzberg, 1973). They listen to and seek out consciously those who are willing to share information, gossip and rumors. Many deliberately cultivate their secretary as a conduit to the secretarial world. Others visit with department chairpersons or grade coordinators, and then deliberately and immediately with department or grade faculty. They visit coffee lounges, take people to lunch, make all the cocktail parties, go to all the athletic events, drop in on school dances and help get kids out of jail. They are everywhere, always. And they are attentive.

Principals develop from these contacts a private catalog of information about their community, their job, their teachers, the pupils passing through the school, parents and their school. They are constantly sifting, storing, evaluating and sharpening their information. Yet this is information they rarely make public. It is a private granery, made up not only of grain, but also chaff. They increasingly find themselves isolated by what they know and cannot reveal, by the secrets they keep. They may know of indiscretions, of joys, of failures, of rebirths which they share only with those who have need to know (Erickson, 1972).

At least one secret that administrators and teachers share is the fact that long-range teacher plans about classroom activities for a particular day are often ignored. The film on India, for example, may not arrive or the day a new unit was supposed to start is moved later in the week to permit students to be reviewed and then to be retested on the last unit.

Another critical secret is the amount of moral discussion which occurs in classrooms. Biology, for example, presents issues involving sex, ecology and the issues of population growth. Often such discussions are rendered morally sterile by the disclaimer of the teacher that students must make such choices in the future, hence they need to understand them now.

Teachers and principals adjust themselves to their students. They share such mutual secrets as college success rests on motivation and intelligence, not high school preparation or that some teachers merely go through the motions because they are frustrated by the abilities and interests of their students. Among themselves they admit to points of boredom, recall days in which their subject was important or worry about too much emphasis on athletics or art.

The secrets they possess tell principals much about others. They come to have knowledge about how teachers behave in classrooms, about how pupils learn, or do not, and about the complexities of family life. To this storehouse of facts are added insights about the values others possess. They are privy to discussions about the morality of others who inhabit their world. They learn of the inevitable pregnancy of a cheerleader, the bruises of a battered child, the alcoholic parent or the joys of first love, the captured prize of a scholarship, and the deliciousness of quiet as the school empties of students and faculty. Thus these facts and values constitute the secret wisdom of school administrators about their schools. It is a wisdom that grows as the administrators stays in the same office and that shapes and reshapes what seems to be influencing what the administrator does or does not do.

Teachers often dislike the texts they use. One persistent, but unstudied complaint is that advanced materials are increasingly taught to younger students. Teachers who can often reject newer editions, editions which they believe kids cannot handle. Those who reject newer editions believe the students cannot put the ideas together or come to grip with advanced concepts, and such student frustration leads to student play or worse.

Principals and teachers are aware of student boredom and their own sense of being unappreciated. Hence, one mythology that often develops is that certain teachers, usually the one telling the tale, is the only teacher in the

building who is able to capture students' attention intellectually, treat them fairly and justly, and appreciate them as whole people. All others, they claim, are inadequate for the tasks of overcoming boredom. Only they are capable and appreciated by their students as teachers.

Administrators and teachers worry about the crazy teacher. Crazy teachers are those who do not believe in the norms of the classroom, the school, the community and the country. Such teachers will confuse the kids and tear down the system.

But administrators also possess their own secret wisdom. Made up of the experiences and values of that individual, this wisdom may be shaped by university classes, by dominant third-grade teachers or by those served under in different sites at other times. This personalistic core judges and assays the deliberately sought wisdom of the school. These individualistic standards of judgment may be hazy or sharp, but provide for the principal a personal vantage point for considering other wisdom garnered about the school.

Loneliness, then, is a result of the inevitable bondage created between needing to know and knowing. The quest to gather information about what is happening, what is current, who's doing what to whom, creates a world in which the principal can share only little bits and pieces with others. The privacy of information makes it a powerful tool for principals to use in their assessment of situations, but a tool rarely used in public. Secret knowledge creates little public power or public authority for the principal, secret values provide a weak base for publicly stated moral judgments, and secret wisdom usually sits idle in public meetings.

Teachers and administrators share conceptions of student readiness. Most seem to feel that students are not yet ready for freedom because students lack the maturity to manage their own time, select their learning materials or handle obvious distractions. They just aren't ready yet.

Teachers rarely share the same bases for dealing with students. Some are concerned with making children responsible for their social actions, others wish to treat students as human beings, some never talk down (at the same level) to the students and others consciously adopt the student lingo. Teachers express these bases to others, including students. The most frequent indicant of this is teachers expressions about what "bores" students.

Teachers and administrators do not share the same moral standards. Teachers, for example, may be upset by the practice of students copying the work of others, or by the amount of free time created by programmed teaching devices. Principals may find copying an inevitable fact of life in schools, but the noise created by a group of students no longer working in programmed texts insufferable.

Any situation the administrator faces, then, is saturated with facts and valuings which could make it damaging to other actors (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Just as the principal develops this catalog of secrets, so too do other actors in the situation. Teachers come to know of "professional lapses" by the principal. They come to see the warts and pimples of their leader. Goffman (1959) describes the situation as follows:

> Since we all participate on teams we must carry within ourselves something of the sweet guild of conspirators. And since each team is engaged in maintaining the stability of some definitions of the situation, concealing or playing down certain facts in order to do this, we can expect the performer to live out his conspiratorial career in some furtiveness (p. 105).

This conspiracy of silence and of stage-setting is fatiguing. The principal finds three avenues of escape: the blandness of platitudes, the joys of paperwork, and the solace of administrative colleagues in other settings.

The glittering generalities of common sense, the banality of platitudes and the drabness of a colorless persona are mechanisms for escaping the public dangers of secret wisdom. Repairing to cliches may provide no purchase on the current situation, but it may seem better than revealing the errors and past inequities which produced the current trauma. Insight, on the other hand, exposes the dynamics of a delicate and far-reaching issue, an issue whose immediate resolution may cast long-term shadows. In such moments, the private world the administrator knows and understands may be upset by public utterances. To preserve that secret world the administrator retreats to a ritualized set of utterances, a ritual enhanced by non-directiveness, by personal blandness or by idiotic ingratiating of actors. Know-nothingness seems a virtue to be displayed in public (Erickson, 1972).

A second way out of the problem of administrative loneliness is the joys of paperwork. Retreating to the desk allows information gathering to occur in quiet, peaceful surroundings without the potential dramas that inevitably stalk the principal. In an intensely interpersonal world in which nothing ever seems constant, the "In" and "Out" signs on most baskets are comfortable markers of tangible successes. Although the baskets will be refilled tomorrow, this fact is less a sadness than a joy. Busyness means that retreat is always possible, a convenient excuse to escape from the delimmas produced by secret wisdom.

A third means of escape are travels. Whether to national conventions, to area meetings of other administrators or on holiday, travel provides necessary therapy by providing non-threatening outlets for sharing secrets. The tales all start with "I have this teacher that . . ." or "Would you believe what this _____(student, counsellor, superintendent, parent, police officer, or all of the above) did . . ." In these professional meetings, at the attendant breakfasts, luncheons, and dinners, or in the omnipresent bars, administrators can share with strangers the secrets of their world. Over the second martini, the fears for the future are discussed. By the fourth, these comrades-in-secrets are providing the details of scandal which those at home have yet to sense. Tragedy and triumph emerge from their winter burrow for a few moments, then retreat in the glare of public disclosure.

Why not use this private wisdom at home to produce change? Why waste it on strangers? Once the unraveling starts, when and where does it stop? The complexities of the life in school provide overlaps which make it difficult to disentangle any specific incident from preceding events (Smith & Keith, 1971). The accretion of secret wisdom provides for few discrete and disjointed cells. A disclosure concerning one individual ensnares others. Not only are others entangled, but sources of information are compromised. The sources of knowing

are avenues which are often bound to secrecy, if more information is to follow later. A slip of the lip not only sinks the ship, but also loses a source of other valuable information. Concern for the entanglement of others as well as protection of sources of information constitute standards of managerial etiquette and taste, generally observed.

Teachers and principals, while proud of their degrees and training, find academic work in education lacking in discipline and motivation. Their real world bears little resemblence to the world depicted in their colleges of education.

Teachers are "shocked" by what their new students do not know or have not been taught. For example, science teachers discover that their new ninth grade students cannot do long division or know how to figure percentages.

Teachers feel they have to do little for the brightest students. They are self-motivated and self-taught, to a large degree. You generally just stand in the hallway and throw the book in the room, or else you find problems whose answer is not found right in the book.

Teachers define good places to teach as sites where they feel they can be the kind of teacher they want to be without feeling pressured from any direction. They seek occasions when students become truly involved or engrossed in learning something, and find their greatest long term pleasure in seeing students come to enjoy learning about their subject matter.

The process by which principals collect and use secret wisdom about schools or teachers about their classrooms present major areas for research activity. At least two lines of inquiry seem important.

One line of investigation needs to explore the categories which structure and integrate the secret knowledges, values and wisdoms of educators (Keddie, 1971; Smith & Keith, 1971; Walker, 1972). For instance, it seems important to know not only the general morality that teachers express about events in the world, but also the specific morality they attach to the way that students learn. While we are accustomed to discussions in classrooms about evolution or abortion or retirement ages, and feel somewhat comfortable studying teachers and controversial issues, we have few handles on how teachers value student attitudes toward learning. Is saying that "learning is hard work" a statement teachers

value from students? What of the joy of learning—do some teachers find such joy a "good" while others label it a "sin," on the order of breaking some educational commandment? What conditions within schools foster or blunt these moral assessments by teachers and administrators about student attitudes toward learning? In what way do administrator images of what teachers do color the administrators judgments about activities that happen in classrooms? For example, Walker (1972) has cogently noted that our concerns about democracy and authority reflect a societal concern which may or may not characterize school classrooms. Teachers and administrators simply may not see classrooms as democratic communities.

A second line of inquiry would explore the development of strategies of secrecy or disclosure. Of particular importance in these analyses would be studies of internal communication flow, fixing on secrets held. Are secrets a better investment than public knowledge by an administrator? That they are held by some, spent by others seems clear. What is not clear are patterns of allocation, of hoarding or of squandering. Does tolerance for loneliness influence these patterns?

Teachers are hyper-sensitive to the tastes of their students. If students do not accept the lesson, the unit, the text or the general approach to a subject, e.g., new math, teachers are quick to abandon the new for their usual pattern. However, they generally continue seeking new devices to interest and to motivate the student.

MURPHY'S LAW: You can fool some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time and that's sufficient.

2. ADMINISTRATORS AND SEASONS

There is a comforting regularity to the school day and the school year. The first bell in the morning summons teachers and pupils to tasks interrupted with regularities such as recess, milk break, lunch period, movement among various classes and school areas, while the last bell dismisses students to buses, cars

and extra-curriculum activities. While time may fly or drag, everybody knows where they are, in terms of space and time, during the day. These days build into regular seasons, dominated by tasks which seem both developmental and inevitable. Fall is a time of football, homecoming and hope while February is the longest and most cruel of all the months. Valentine's Day seems a false promise, a betrayal to be underscored by the last bite of winter in early March (Geertz, 1973; Sorokin and Merton, 1937).

Teachers have senses of when students are fresh or when they are tired. Many elementary teachers, for example, do math and reading in the morning. Most consciously plan how to handle the half hour before and immediately after lunch.

The seasons are often linked to the maturation of students. Most fifth grade teachers fear the spring because it marks for many girls the beginning of their menstrual cycle. The appearance of training bras and the cycle of whose at what stage of development become the rites of most fifth grade springs.

By mid October most teachers have a fairly decent idea of what kinds of students they have for this school year. They can assess how successfully they will be able to meet their general planning for the year. They have also begun to set their expectation levels, preparing to accept the general lack of understanding of a particular lesson or topic by a class and contemplating why certain individual students can not handle the tasks the whole class can.

Teachers and students come to expect a grading pattern which usually begins with students being graded "hard," and most marginal students receiving the lower grade. By the second grading period, assessments have been made and changes from that mark over the course of the year are rare.

In high school, teachers who coach a sport are usually tired at the end of their season. This tiredness is often exhibited by a failure to search around for new ways to do things, and a marked increase in reading and recitation using the text.

The regularities provide important markers for those who run schools. In a distinctive sense, seasons provide two short-range sets of goals for organizational members. One set of goals deals with intellectual tasks. Teachers have to come to grips with where students are in their intellectual development. The second set of goals deal with the crises likely to occur during a particular season. For instance, the last two or three days of school provide multiple opportunities for havoc. Knowing this, teachers and administrators arm themselves to weather

these storms. Seasons provide sets of conditions which must be tended to, which demand fresh looks at old and all-to-familiar scenes or new stories to spice-up repetitive, slow-motion replays of incidents that occur at this time every year. While the cast of characters seems constantly changing, the fundamental processes seem invariant.

This periodicity, this sense of shared "social time" provides an important regularity to those who administer. In the first place, it provides a comforting sense that what one has learned over time is not wasted by application to current issues. The inevitable ritual of changing student's schedules or of dealing with a problem of illegal smoking underscores the values of the lessons of the past, of the commonplaces of the current situation and of the probabilities of the same thing happening tomorrow. Second, these regularities produce a sense of prediction and anticipation. Everybody knows that within the next week or two, an event on this order will occur. It may be the increase in petty thefts that precede Christmas or the inevitable spring cafeteria riot; the veterans arm themselves for what must occur. Third, these events bond those who are responsible for schools into conspiracies bent on denying these anticipations to their charges. What students don't know they may not try. What have been anticipated in school rules or student handbooks are now routinized, normalized, sanitized and safe.

The calendar of the school year provides a tempo to the life of the school. Bulletin boards reflect the seasons outside the school building, but principals and teachers have their own calendar. This calendar provides a sense of "social time," of what is about to happen, of what can be forestalled by rules, persuasion and luck, and of new and mysterious outbreaks. It is this anticipation of the new and mysterious which galvanizes reactions to seemingly trivial happenings. While old and familiar dislocations may be of major scale, minor incidents which augur

new problems are pounced on with fervor. These new notes upset the traditional and established rhythms.

Against the periodicity flow events which seek to upset this tempo. Efforts to introduce new events, be they athletic, scholastic or extra-curriculum, upset the conventional time frames. Compliance with new mandates involves the possibility of disturbing the regularities of the seasons within the school. These new and jarring irregularities destroy senses of continuity with the past, disrupt usual patterns of organizational learning, and upset regular and predictable events. These perturbations upset the delicate timing of seasonal living in a school.

Administrators come to distrust those who seek to introduce new elements into the school. Their wisdom, accreted so consciously over the years, is of little or no value in dealing with the new. Almost immediately the principal of a school begins negotiating with the new on two questions. First, in what ways does the new disturb the patterns and worth of "secrets?" Second, in what ways does the new disturb the tempo of the school year? If the answers to both these questions suggest the new is highly disruptive, then protective mechanisms are called into being to reject the transplant.

These two questions delimit severely opportunities to produce sharp and dramatic changes in schools. They dictate instead incremental strategies which value both secrets and timing. Just as important as the general reaction to the new are the enshrinement of these general criteria for judgment of all events. Over time these questions produce a consistently biased way of assessing the worth not only of the new but also of the old. These questions come to dominate the life of the school—they are the commonplaces of schooling and its administration. They become the major commandments: Protect thy secrets; and, Protect thy calendar.

These commandments dictate not only conservative but also liberalizing behavior in schools. While they are paramount as tools of preservation, those who seek new experiences, new insights, new ways of doing things must protect against attacks along these two flanks. If school people do experiment, do try things, they also must maintain the fundamental sense of their secrecy and that of others around them. As teachers, they must not criticize colleagues or upset the expected seasons. As administrators, they must protect teacher rights. In those efforts at change, new elements must be added to definitions of secrecy or new timetables to the seasons of the school. The trade-offs of trying and installing the new are strict adherence to the old commandments.

Those who are strangers to the school cause the highest peril to these commandments. New building principals share no secret life, although prior experience in schools suggests that they do have secrets. Prior experience by administrators also implies a sense of timing. The richness of these earlier experiences in foreign places may ease some tension, but what must be anticipated by new administrators is that those in the setting will begin a process of building secrets and sensing the tempo of newcomers. The round of getting-acquainted gatherings provides opportunities for not only presentations of self as a dramatic persona, but also for presentations of secret, backstage information and values. Inevitably, these gatherings legitimate both the quest for and the value of insider's secrets and the possibilities for new tempos from outsiders.

Secrets and seasons help the changing to stay the same. Secrets that are shared by the new with the old look much like those shared in the past. For most new principals the bulk of the faculty will stay the same, teaching their subjects in their familiar ways in their last year's room. As intimacy grows, a new principal finds out what the old one knew, and begins to act in many of the same ways. The third grade teacher, for example, continues to accentuate

science over reading, or the fourth grade teacher still hates any child with a snotty nose. The year requires the first fist fight, the first loss at basketball, the squabbles over selection of a new math textbook and the unending calls about a braless young teacher. The comforts of budget preparation or scheduling students are there, ever-present and dependable.

We need a better sense of the regularity of the school year and of its influence on the life in schools. It seems worthwhile to explore two major areas. First, in what ways does the regularity of life in schools become the engine for school events? The traditional ways of doing things are not random, but may well be based on a set of developmental tasks linked to variables such as the maturation levels of children, the fatigue factor of teachers and the sensitivity of an administrator to the time of year. These tasks may be created by students or teachers or administrators, and they equally may benefit some or all of these groups differently (Karabel & Halsey, 1976). What seems lacking are understandings of the way these regularities dictate the patterns of life in schools. Second, in what ways do new events arise and become part of these regularities? What are the characteristics of events which are rejected, are modified or are incorporated intact? Are events which make public old secrets the most feared? Some sense needs to be made of the ebb and flow of events which are involved in this selection process. Is some Darwinian analogy of survival of the fittest appropriate for exploration of the survival rates or is there some welfare mechanism which protects the poor and weak? Are there cost-benefit ratios calculated about upsetting regularities?

MURPHY'S LAW: Every activity takes more time than you have.

3. ADMINISTRATORS AND MORALITY

The administration of schools is an exercise in morality, cloaked in technical jargon. The essence of administrative morality is the use of secrets to good ends. The dilemma of this morality is that secrets provide few clues either to their use or to the ends to which they may be put (Erickson, 1972; Jackson, 1976-1977). Instead of providing authoritative guidance for what ought to be, the secret wisdom of the school collectively and the wisdoms of the individuals involved are tangled webs, probably beyond the power of a single individual to unsnarl. What administrators must decide, then, is what means are appropriate for simplifying their world and for making decisions in the light of their simplifications.

The technical jargon of the administrator, summarized in such arcane initials as P.P.B.S. (Planning, Programming, Budgeting System), M.B.O. (Management By Objectives) or M.M. (Matrix Management), is a device for simplification. What these technical tools do, however, is to present public orderings of processes which appear to be of little consequence to most organizational members. Most members, teachers, for example, see these technical systems as aiding and organizing the work of the administrator. What, in fact, most administrators believe is that these devices postpone or legitimate major decisions already made about the use or disregard of managerial secrets. They postpone administrative decisions by putting other people to work on "non-jobs," such as creating work charts or breaking tasks into meaningless parts, thus generating time for the principal to survey and to generate truly useful information. These newly gleaned, or already long-held secrets become bases for decisions that are reached. Secrets make possible negiotiations about goals, while technical devices make possible public displays which are cosmetic, but organizationally irrelevant.

Secrets provide the groundwork for negotiations on what goals or subgoals the organization and its individual members will actually seek (Mitchell, 1971). Hence, the school is a set of micro-compacts between principal and teacher, between teacher and teacher, and between teacher and student. If elaborated and made public, these compacts would form a constitution for the school. But this constitution would be a document which guaranteed few universal rights. In point of fact, the nature of managerial information in schools suggests that public displays of equality are capable of being undermined by secrets which report the inherent inequalities of teachers, students and classrooms.

The administrator faces two dilemmas. One dilemma involves the personalistic wisdom the administrator applies to teachers and pupils. A single teacher whose sex life is too active may be the object for personalistic censure, at the very moment professional wisdom suggests praise for the development of a new unit in music appreciation. The second dilemma involves the relative weights to be given to personalistic and professional wisdoms. Most managerial secrets are combinations of both personalistic and professional wisdoms. As the principal plans to use these in negotiations with teachers or students, the judgment of how to load the argument to achieve a desired outcome becomes critical.

Teachers suggest differences among levels of administrators. Generally those at the building level are known, respected and considered a part of the "we" group which is against the "they" group found in central offices. Central office administrators are seen as trying to do things to justify their job, lack clear senses of what they ought to be doing, play politics with local officials to hold down taxes, and should be made to teach one class a year just to keep in touch with reality.

It is at this point, this concern for goals, that the issues of morality most frequently arise. To deflect interests of a teacher, the principal must know what processes using secret wisdom will be effective, not destructive, and to what ends the teacher must be re-directed. Secrets can be destructive weapons, and must be handled with great care.

Secret wisdom makes possible the destruction of the presentation of self by others. Principals may use secrets which destroy the dramaturgical presence teachers develop in their classrooms. Equally, teachers are adept at suggesting disclosure of secrets to students as a way of maintaining order. Trafficking in secrets implies the ability to destroy the public image of others. Hence, teamwork, rights of privacy and intimate places are all essential mechanisms for maintenance of secrecy. But such protective devices are easily overturned, such covers "blown," in moments of play, anger or intense negotiation.

As the rites of negotiation begin, then, we can expect two separate arenas of negotiations. One arena concerns itself with the morality of the negotiating process itself. What are the roles of secrets in negotiations? The second arena involves discussions of goals. What are the roles of secrets in selecting goals?

These first stage negotiations about negotiating begin with a period of probing to explore which secrets can be leaked and which are protected. Both parties, for example, teacher and pupil, principal and teacher, union negotiator and board attorney, are concerned with setting the boundaries of disclosure. They have learned from experience to expect some leaking of some private knowledge, but certain taboo areas generally are agreed upon either by past convention or current understanding. As good old boys, or professional teachers, or fellow students, they have developed an etiquette of disclosure.

The mid-stages of negotiation involve the allocating of secrets to various goals, and the delimitation of alternatives. This is a process of exhortation, of bullying and bluffing, and of elimination of mutually unacceptable goals. In this stage the major issue of morality becomes one of inequality among peers. The limits of managerial discretion and employee capacity to be treated differently are examined, and some form of bargain consummated. This bargain sets the groundwork for the third, and final, stage.

The final stage is the effort by both parties to maintain the compact. It is the attempt to achieve permanence, although both know that events will shortly upset what has just been agreed upon. In this final stage, markers are often suggested which permit the interpretation of how to deal with matters of continuity or change in the immediate future. Symbols of agreeing on how to agree or on how to disagree are interpreted and formalized. Both parties now have expectations about future behavior.

Collective bargaining agreements have defined the central elements of the teacher's role, and little else. Teachers have always worked hard, and worked hardest at those things which were of greatest interest to them. Secrets no longer are as important on side issues, but they still are critical for central parts of teaching. Work rules deal with unimportant issues, but the centrality of classroom teaching appears little influenced by bargaining.

Negotiation stages involve secret wisdom. The compact that is struck, the agreement made involves larger moral issues. The morality of negotiating about negotiation depends upon relatively well-understood uses of secrets.

Less clear are the secrets involved in efforts to change the goals of teachers or students. Agreeing to negotiate is one thing, but agreeing upon goals seems different, somehow. In discussing goals the etiquette of the negotiating process is of little help. Here a new and major issue develops. This becomes the point where the issue of generations arises.

Schools house many generations. Young and older teachers, administrators, students and parents are scattered among many different generations. For sake of simplicity, I shall consider that schools are made up of three generations: students, teachers and administrators. The existence of these multiple generations creates the contextual surroundings for issues of morality.

The dilemmas of morality which develop for administrators involve tensions on two major dimensions of judgment (personalistic and public) among themselves, teachers and students. For each of these generations, there exist different personalistic and public moralities, moralities shaped in part by the unique

comprehension of differing historical events and their interpretation. Different public expressions, different manners and different senses of presentation separate these generations, and generate equivocality (Weick, 1969).

Two factors, equivocality of judgments and the regularities of schools, bond these generations together. First, as Mannheim (1952) has written:

> . . .the teacher-pupil relationship is not as between one representative of 'consciousness in general' and another, but as between one possible subjective center of vital orientation and another subsequent one. This tension appears incapable of solution except for one compensating factor: not only does the teacher educate his pupil, but the pupil educates his teacher too. Generations are in a state of constant interaction (p. 301).

The constant interaction produces a mutual learning effect.

In schools, this learning effect is reflected in the equivocality of judgments made. The capability of an experienced teacher or administrator to compare his/her generation and several generations which have passed through the school to the current generation produces moral equivocality. Administrator's or teacher's language is a language sprinkled with exception to general rules, with strong moral assertations immediately tempered by uncertainties. Commandments about going to college to earn a good living are challenged by students, for example. Emphasis on getting good grades to get into your selected college are upset by the active recruitment of students by colleges. In these, and many other instances, the comingling of generations in a school produces a strong sense of the equivocality of personal and public criteria for morality. What develops is both a healthy respect for the unpredictability and ambiguity of human events and mechanisms for dealing with these issues (Page, 1976).

Unpredictability leads to what may be called the code of "another chance." Students, in particular, should not be definitively dealt with on the basis of any single case, but should always be given another opportunity. While the stated rationale in such cases suggests that students will come to see the

wisdom of their elder generations, following Mannheim, it seems just as likely that elders will come to see the value in what the younger generation is proposing.

Administrators know, for instance, that if they have only one teacher dealing with a single subject, e.g., world history, the students entire educational experience in that subject is determined by the quality of that teacher. A student's understanding of and appreciation for world history may be impoverished by a weak teacher.

Teachers suspect that their students are sharper or brighter than most teachers believe. But they have almost no concrete notions of why students are not motivated to use this ability in their class. This frustration becomes a major concern. It often leads to a philosophy that some students inevitably will fail, simply because they will not try.

Teachers rarely talk to parents, and if they do the comments are usually negative. Teachers take this as a sign of acceptance of what they are doing.

The equivocality produced by the interactions of these multiple generations is affected by a second factor. The periodicity of the school means that some events are predictable. Hence, the equivocality of particular events is covered by general rules aimed at control of the younger generation. Contained in student handbooks, distributed on ditto sheets and pronounced over school-wide communication networks, student and faculty life creates a constituted state. This state anticipates the general events, festivals and rites which will occur during the school year. These happenings encompass the physical, moral and psychic tempo of the school year. Long live Halloween!

These rules constitute the baseline for the cases of discretionary justice which occurs during the school year (Manley-Casimir, 1977; Eliott, forthcoming). These rules and their application become the points at which administrators deal with student, parent and teacher, and the points at which generations interact. In these interactions, administrators often seek to apply what appears to be universalistic rules. These rules are countered by various generational assessments of the offending act. In such conferences justice is less blind than discretionary. The contents of discretionary criteria which determine rules

often becomes the object of intensive re-examination. The wisdom gained and stored over time comes under scrutiny in these instances of supposedly rule-bound behavior.

Often, the tensions which develop in such cases find the administrator pitted against the teacher. These instances require that administrators balance differing generational interpretations, official school rule or policy, policy as seen by the teacher and the administrator's own personalistic assessment of the issue. Exactly how these factors are weighed, how considerations and judgments are formed or whether persistent prejudices and injustices or balanced and humane judgments occur appears unstudied in administrative literature. Of even greater interest would be the shifts which occur over time in the administrator's assessment of situations. What factors produce changes in the interpretation of the "wrongness," let us say, of smoking, drug taking, lying or cheating on tests?

MURPHY'S LAW: By making something absolutely clear, somebody will be confused.

4. ADMINISTRATORS AND COLDNESS

Those who administer become quickly dilettantes. They sample superficially the latest ideas in curriculum change, in football huddles, in student fashions and in popular literature. The pace at which they work, their constant quest for information, and the inevitable paperwork all seem to cause the administrative retreat into superficiality, wide coverage of topics and demands for brief, pithy insights into what is happening.

Administrative superficiality makes possible administrative distance. Distance means that administrators can be both calculating and cold. Becoming a dilettante permits administrators to calculate actions and to gain psychological distance from those whose secrets they share.

The phenomena concomitant with declining enrollments--struggles over buildings, size of classes, what curricula offerings to continue or delete--seem to accentuate coldness. Decision pressures seem to require greater distance, distance kept easiest by those who share the fewest secrets. The issues of justifying old buildings in childless neighborhoods on economic grounds seem foreign to most teachers and many administrators.

The calculation of action, the imaginative by-play in which alternative actions are envisioned, is enhanced by superficial knowledge of the surrounding environment and not too secret knowledge of the organization. The school principal, then, seeks to grasp hasty generalizations about changes in parental practices, assessments of the athletic program, shifts in college requirements, the latest in computer assisted instruction and current villains in educational practice, such as "new math." Administrators consciously seek to create scenes which are scripted by the superficial wisdom they collect. These scenes are reality-tested against some of the intimate, secret knowledge they possess about organizational members. In order to bring the shifts principals sense occurring in the environment to bear on the life of the school, principals must influence their co-workers. These attempts at influence must account for the secrets and regularities shared by their faculties.

Superficiality helps create a sense of coldness which can counter the secrets shared with others. A careful examiniation of a situation may produce a host of competing hypotheses about why a teacher treated a student in a particular way; a superficial examination may suggest a "bad" pupil or an "incompetent" teacher. By flitting across the surface of complex situation, administrators are able to use their "deliberate ignorance" as a device for making what they believe to be highly rational choices. They are able to ignore the intricacies of the situations, making intrepid decisions on the shallowest of information. In this manner the administrator seeks to become less encumbered, or to overlook completely, past secrets.

The ruptures with the bonds of past associations may produce ripples of discontent among others, particularly those who share intimate secrets with the administrator. Many displays of "deliberate ignorance" and of coldness on the part of administrators lead undoubtedly to a cycle in which secrets are no longer shared, administrative coldness and unintended ignorance are increased, and turnover rates accelerated. Infrequent displays of coldness, on the other hand, are important devices for creating re-assessments of the situation. These outbursts re-create the calculative involvement of organizational participants, recall past sharings of secrets and remind participants of the dimensions of their involvement in organizational life.

Teachers frequently justify assignments by urging students to do them to the best of their ability and complete them. The completion signifies that students have accomplished something, and have learned something about responsibility and about following directions. These are critical characteristics for the students' later life, both on the job or in college.

Another device which may indirectly add in making and keeping distance between educators are frequent pronouncements about educational philosophies. Statements about the goals of education, the most suitable means of achieving these objectives and the roles of teachers and learners not only bind the like-minded together but also establish important differences among opposing camps. For administrators, the philosophies of various teachers provide contrasts between what the administrator believes and what the teacher believes, and also permit sharp scrutiny of differences between "what is preached" and "what is practiced." The frequent espousals of faith, of educational slogans, of hodge-podges of rumor, research and practice wisdom, provide opportunities to create distance from other.

Students need to learn to follow rules--it is an important thing for future life. A good education is the basis for getting ahead.

Some relations seems to exist between administrative coldness and survival rates of administrators. One line of inquiry would study administrators who have well developed senses of what organizational participants should do and who are extremely cold because they are less prone to become involved in or share secrets. A second line would study coldness is a function of mobility prospects, e.g., the more likely the administrator can leave for a better position, the greater distance the administrator creates among subordinates. A third line of inquiry might see if cold administrators survive because distance means they interfere very little in the operation of the organization. Organizational success or failure depends upon other participants, and the presence or absence of administrators is of little consequence. Another line of reasoning, and the last mentioned here, would see if administrators receive marching orders ("mandates") from superiors which they are expected to carry out. These orders separate them from the world of their subordinates. Survival depends on efforts to carry out mandates, not please subordinates.

Administrative coldness seems a useful device for assessment of the careers of self and others. In those moments when standards rather than secrets, when information rather than intimacy are used for assessment, the nature of those who are co-workers is often made clear, and frightening. For the application of such universalistic standards requires seeing the parochial interests which drive the life of most of your associates. Not only do their feet seem to be made of clay, but from the neck up they appear to be made of brass. As we perceive our contemporaries, their unfulfilled promises and unlived dreams, small secrets seem important, small victories become critical, and minor works become masterpieces. Cast against the superficial and unrelenting standards, generated often by the notions of excellence, and sponsored by shallowness of administrator analysis, the world of the school can appear futile, with few successes. But,

such coldness must be moderated if administrators are to persist in that organization. They cannot stand completely apart from secrets; they cannot avoid some entangling alliances with colleagues which are necessary to the on-going life of the school.

MURPHY'S LAW: It's easier to make a commitment or to get involved in something than to get out of it.

TOWARD RESEARCH AGENDAS

This concluding section deals specifically with notions provided by the NIE mandate for this paper. It is divided into three sections: governance/decision-making structures; vertical coordination; and, horizontal coordination.

Governance/Decision-Making Structures. The last decade has witnessed an extensive debate about the responsiveness of school to the needs of their immediate clients and to the desires of the larger society. The resolution of that discussion has come less from definitive changes by schools or clients and more by shifts in the interests of the larger society. Mechanisms of participation, such as student involvement in course, curriculum or school planning and citizens advisory groups invented to assist individual school sites or entire school districts, have a track record of ineffectiveness. These mechanisms seem to spring into life in a time of crisis, but quickly ossify and become little more than window-dressing. Current debate which urges site management of schools seems doomed to the same fate.

Many who have urged local involvement have seen two sinister forces lurking in the wings to capture the schools. The courts and the unions appear as Big Brothers, intent on watching over local schools. Court mandates in areas such as desegregation, disciplining of students and special education have shaped the general contours of school systems. Districts have worked their way through

desegregation plans, have established due process procedures for student dicipline and have begun mainstreaming. Teacher unions have affected the budget-making process, seeking to increase teacher benefits and to reduce administrative costs. The strict delineation of hours to be worked, costs to be incurred and benefits to be gained by employees have influenced dollars spent, but had little direct influence on the work that teachers do.

Issues such as student participation, unionization or court controls are but brief episodes which augment but do not overcome the general mechanisms of the school year. They do not, and I believe cannot, override the secrets shared by administrators and teachers about life in schools. Neither do these modern issues overcome the issues of morality administrators and teachers confront. Finally, these mechanisms have little impact on the seasons of schooling. The one area these forces may influence is the distance administrators feel from community and teachers.

These notions suggest that efforts to control behavior in schools, to regiment the activities of students, teachers and administrators, are difficult. Schools, it would seem, are highly individualistic, like Hobbesian states in which the appropriate unit for analysis is the self-interested individual. What goes on in a particular classroom or school appears best viewed from an individualistic perspective. The actions of solitary actors predominate. While there are moments of grouping, differences predominate. Each classroom is made up of an individual teacher facing individual students. Each member of that unit appears capable of almost complete and absolute autonomy. Classrooms, and schools in general, provide an amazing number of opportunities for individuals to withdraw from social activities. Teachers, for example, sum up these situations under concepts like "day-dreaming" while they achieve isolation from administrators

by closing their classroom doors. Schools provide multiple opportunities for privacy, solitude and even silent rebellion against the demands of others. Withdrawal constitutes an important element in the schooling experiences of students, teachers and administrators.

This line of reasoning suggests that teachers and students are ungoverned and ungovernable. In one sense, this seems to be the case. But at least three factors help in governance of schools and influence decision-making.

The first factor is the sharing of secrets among teachers, administrators and students. The web of intimate knowledge created by living together helps form individuals into teams bent on maintaining their performances. New elements which intrude onto this stage are incorporated into the act. If, for instance, the court demands due process procedures when students are suspended, new forms are printed, new lines rehearsed and refined on early cases, and a dependable script created to handle these recurrent issues. Or, if teachers are involved in team teaching, their public displays are staged so that all members of the team appear, interact freely and loosely as if they were "chums," and suggest differences among themselves are minor. Tensions which may exist and be known to the principal, specialization of tasks which gives some happiness and others grief, and those opportunities to be with a small group of "his/her" students are secrets shared by those who team teach.

A second factor which binds is the regularities of life in schools. The seasons offer comforting markers about what is happening. The development and maturation of youth as they come to grips with the intellectual tasks that others have faced in years gone by are predictable and of solace to the weary. The turning of leaves, the first snow, the struggle to name the top and bottoms of fractions or to separate transitive and intransitive verbs are important continuities for those in schools. The reading of "Silas Marner" is a universal.

Finally, the senses of morality which permeate most schools fit with those of the community (McGivney and Moynihan, 1972). Most teachers and administrators have grown up in similar communities, attended similar types of training institutions and want to live in a community like the community they now serve. They are at home, among those they understand. While they may be convinced that the students are too narrow, they ultimately believe that this narrowness can be overcome and that where they live is still the most desirable of all situations. The traditions of schools and of the experience of schooling are clear and ever-present in most communities. While parents may be "fooled" by newer teaching methods, most know what schools did to them, most remember a world of secrets and seasons, and most know what they want done to and for their children.

For example, most teachers and parents believe that the chief role of schools is as preparation for adult life. What goes on in schools is judged less by its current consequences than by its longer range consequences. Tardiness, for instance, is a nuisance to the school, but a major fault in later job-related life situations. Failing to grasp the characteristics of a problem in third grade, for instance, must be linked to life chances by the third grade teacher because that failure entails the inability to move later to eighth grade algebra or college higher mathematics. The payoff of "goofing off" in the third grade persists over time. Whether or not this generalized belief about preparation is true or false is not at issue at this moment. What is of consequence is that this belief becomes a way of viewing the schools as a pressing environment in which the old hope to make the young see the long-range consequences of immediate behaviors. This belief permeates the moral decisions faced by teachers, administrators and parents and either puts them in consensus or sharp disagreement about student actions.

But against the grain of secrets, seasons and morality have been recent developments which may have accentuated the distance of the administrator. The last few years have witnessed "rebellions" of teachers via unions, "restrictions" of administrative discretion by courts and "erosions" of administrator influence by students. Whether these claims can be supported by empirical evidence or whether they are simply new labels for older phenomena have not been investigated. On the surface, at least, these claims suggest discontinuities which should make administrators more distant from teachers and students. As a group, administrators should feel less appreciated and more abused by participants, courts and unions. These conditions would suggest a cynical, get-tough, no involvement policy toward faculty and students.

In sum, the governance/decision-making system of the school involves self-selected teachers and administrators serving in communities they find to be like home. Those they serve most intimately, students, are coerced to attend but the parents of these students are most frequently in agreement with the teachers and administrators. Those in schools are involved in a life of continuity created not only by the maturation of youth and the demands of instruction but also by secrecy because much that they know could be harmful to others. Under these conditions, issues such as student participation, unionization or court controls are but brief episodes with minimal impact on schooling. Administrators may see unionized teachers as less committed or court controls as limiting discretion, but in the long run these intrusions do little to deflect the general mechanisms of life in schools. Changes can not override the secrets of administrators and teachers, they do not still the seasons or deflect the morality associated with schooling as preparation for life.

Vertical Coordination. The autonomous characteristics of much of schooling impedes the usual power associated with control of resources and evaluation of the application of these resources. In the next few pages, our interest shall

be on the problems of resource control, both physical and personnel, and issues associated with evaluation procedures.

The resources most closely linked to schooling--time and dollars--are generally controlled by formula (James, Kelley & Garms, 1969). The allocation of teacher time is influenced by number of subjects to be taught, length of the school day or class "hour," number of students and number of "free" periods, such as recess or preparation period. Most teachers in a school deal with roughly the same number of students over the same number of hours. Exceptions to these formulas are usually made on the basis of classes of personnel or subject matter so that department chairpersons or English teachers, for example, may receive extra time for preparation. Dollars are also allocated by formulas: salaries, supplies, athletic equipment, new texts and professional travel. Ratios of dollars per teacher or per class taught are common.

The allocation of time within classrooms has drawn attention in the last few years. The seemingly obvious relationship between time and learning has suggested that teachers need to interact more with students. Exactly where else this line of reasoning leads seems less certain. Some have sought to link time spent not only to teacher learning but also to teacher evaluation.

In a real sense, teacher evaluation is also done by formula. In many districts, the constant quest to acquire new teachers and to deal with grievances consumes much more time and energy of administrators than do efforts to evaluate and improve experienced teachers. What time is spent on teacher evaluation is most often structured by checklists of attributes which seem connected to teaching in some mysterious fashion. The plethora of instruments available, category schemes available and technologies such as video-tapes which could be brought to bear on a single classroom teacher are awesome. The instances in which these instruments, schemes and machines actually do enter a classroom are rare.

In general, the allocation of resources and the practices of evaluation protect the autonomy of the individual teacher (Dreeben, 1970; Lortie, 1969). The protection of autonomy rests upon two fundamental facts of schooling. First, most of the work that teachers do is governed by the individual teacher. In most classrooms, they are the central and solitary figure working with students. The decisions they make, the games they play and the jokes they tell are intent upon shaping relations with their students and classes. Second, individual teachers select and accentuate differing goals and ends in the classroom. As noted earlier, these are not capricious choices but are reflections of reasoning which express individual tastes and propensities, professional training and community norms. These selections are the right of every teacher, unless individuals go too far and both reveal secrets and upset seasons.

The vertical coordination of schools, hence, involves the issues of negotiations concerning seasons and secrets and is influenced strongly by senses of morality and distance. These factors in various combinations suggest the shape of vertical coordination in schools. Administrators and other teachers are morally outraged, for example, when a teacher reveals secrets or upsets the regularities of school life. In such rare cases, the administrator with the support of staff creates distance from the offending teacher and drives him/her out of the school. In other instances, faculties and administrators may re-negotiate the boundaries of acceptable behavior, so that female teachers may now wear pantsuits or students who are drug pushers may be hounded out of school. What exists, then, is a society kept together by intimate knowledge, private practices and the regularities of certain events.

Horizontal Coordination. It is hard for most of us to think about teachers working together. Most of our images of teachers are of single and solitary

creatures facing a sea of faces. Efforts to change this image through such activities as team teaching or collegial exchange have been largely unsuccessful. The vast majority of teachers work alone in conventional classrooms.

This self-selection of a work environment reveals much about why efforts to impose mechanisms of horizontal coordination have generally failed. The key to understanding the type of environment teachers seek is their ability to control their definitions of what it is they do when they teach. The autonomy and equality of vertical coordination is part and parcel of the ability of teachers to shop around, adopting and adapting practices to suit their own tastes. Those teachers who wish to team teach will seek situations where teaching occurs just as those who favor open space arrangements work diligently to find them. If teachers are assigned to an open school, but favor self-contained classrooms, they will "create" self-contained classrooms, regardless of the architecture.

One cannot ignore the amount of shopping around that teachers do. For example, teachers often shop for advice from instructional specialists or for college/university courses which may pertain to issues. They are constantly on the lookout for entertaining and motivating techniques for their classrooms. The criterion for what gets bought, however, appears to be "what looks best on me." The matters of taste, and in matters of taste there are no disputes, command the selection of what is to be purchased or of how originals are to be tailored to better suit the new owner.

This shopping around phenomena seems everpresent in schools. Just as teachers shop for classes they would like to teach, administrators hunt for schools they would like to "run," and students elect the classes the want, bargain-hunting for those teachers they believe best suited to their needs. Often student class-schedules are determined by the amount of time they wish

to share with their friends. Finally, and obviously, many parents shop for school districts, for schools and for teachers.

Most teachers and administrators believe that the senior class is at best 15% college material, but 60% will go to college. Students may demand college prep courses and then either be unable to do the work or not go to college. Even those who should not go to college can go if they wish because colleges are recruiting "bodies" to stay in business.

Self-selection and shopping constitute important factors hindering coordination among peers, but alone do not explain completely the lack of coordination. The other major factor is that students are the major single influence on what goes on in the classroom, and as this factor, create major problems that teachers believe are secrets.

Teachers believe certain propositions about their students and the materials they teach. Over time, however, students and subjects force teachers to moderate these public expressions.

Teachers get tired of students chipping away about how tough they are, about how hard the material is and about why they have to study this stuff anyhow. These complaints wear away at the teacher and finally, he/she give in to the need for student love. It's no fun being called a no good S.O.B. day after day, year after year. Some day every teacher has to either give in or else give up.

It's common knowledge that most kids won't understand the more complex stuff, like high math or science. They may not even grasp the logic of an English sentence. What kind of a person consciously seeks a career of teaching things to kids that kids neither can understand or appreciate?

Horizontal coordination demands the sharing of disillusionment. Rather than this mode of sharing, most teachers prefer to keep their own counsel, finding happiness in solitary successes and sadness in failures. Public disclosures of the erosion of optimism by teachers are just as distressing as national figures about the turnover rates of teachers. The secrets of those who know well the darker side of teaching, of things such as boredom, failure and intellectual atrophy, are kept to oneself or shared in guarded conversations with peers. Only after deciding to leave teaching can public explanations reveal those characeristics which make teaching a "bad" job.

The fads and fashions that often sweeps education, much as the crash diets which promise weight loss and sexual prowess, are symptoms of the loneliness of teaching. They provide common bonds which pull together solitary souls and common targets of opportunity for routinized individualists. The life expectancy which these panaceas have seems linked to their ability to provide forums for exchanges of secrets without destroying public facades. They also suggest that boredom is just as powerful a cause for change as is new knowledge or new materials.

Horizontal coordination, thus, involves self-selection and coping with the pressures created by students. Outnumbered by students, armed with their own senses of worth and the worth of their message, teachers lead autonomous lives in schools. As strangers in crowded hallways, the secrets they share with fellow workers are furtive and shared only with those who will maintain a vow of silence. Such a conspiracy leads some to flee for other lives, some to become hermits and some to seek salvation in faddish movements which link them to other people. The directions the individual moves depends upon self-selected criteria. Those who cannot keep secrets, who find seasons too repetitive or who do not believe in second chances for children leave teaching. Those who remain in teaching find pleasures in the comforts of the seasonal changes, share the joys of backstage knowledge with others and express optimism and hope about the future.

Summary. This brief exploration of governance/decision-making, vertical coordination and horizontal coordination suggests that the notions of secrets, seasons, morality and distance leads us from the school as a factory toward a school of autonomous and self-regulated individuals. Authority appears to reside in the choice of individuals about whom they obey, how they participate, what they acknowledge or ignore and what outcomes they value. The glue binding these individuals are webs of secrets, the ebb and flow of seasons, ambiguities

and equivocalities linked to multi-generational institutions and the distance administrators can create between themselves and those around them.

These notions lead us away from ideas expressed in terms such as regimentation, efficiency, obedience and standardization. The happy images of all for one and one for all observed in war movies, novels and the oratory of coaches miss the mark in schools. Schools are breeding grounds of alternatives, alternatives which resist the plans of curriculum theorists, administrators, parents, teachers and students. As long as secrets change, as seasons subtly remain longer or leave sooner, as generations vary in their abilities to learn and administrators remain close to their peers, schools will offer opportunities for self-selection. In that opportunity, in that denial of coordination, control and facilitation, lies the essence of the changing character of schooling.

Self-selection permits ignoring the past and creating fantasy about the future. Both are hard activities either to legislate or to control. Schools sometimes try to permit them, sometimes try to encourage them and sometimes try to stamp them out. What is so pleasant for those who live in schools is the fact that the new generation does not have to replicate past generations. The slippery linkage between past and present, the delicious uncertainty about what is necessary for tomorrow, are capable of enhancement in schools. To require administrators to provide blueprints for teachers or for teachers to chart courses for students denies what we all know about yesterday, today and tomorrow (Cohen and March, 1974).

Hence, analyses of coordination, control and facilitation of instruction should explore the impacts of seasons, secrets, morality and distance on behaviors of those in schools. These notions appear to be parts of a metaphor which sees schools "as if" they were something other than "knowledge factories." As the

dimensions of new metaphors are explored, and as we reject the older industrial model, we may come to value more self-selection. While self-selection disrupts efficiency in automobile assembly lines, it may be a critical factor for understanding what happens in schools and what occurs because of them. Closer inspection of self-selection using notions like secrets or seasons may be one way of understanding schooling. This effort at agenda-setting has sought to pique our curiosity enough to begin thinking about metaphors for viewing schools other than those of a factory. For if we view schools as factories, I believe we have involved ourselves in the kind of thinking which lead to the Edsel. We may want something better than that.

MURPHY'S LAW: If you improve or tinker with something long enough, eventually it will break.

REFERENCES

1. Brown, R. H., Social theory as a metaphor: On the logic of discovery for the sciences of conduct. Theory and Society, 1976, 3, 169-197.
2. Burlingame, M., Impact of policy decisions on schools. In L. S. Shulman (Ed.), Review of Research in Education, 5. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, in press.
3. Callahan, R. E., Education and the cult of efficiency: A study of the social forces that have shaped the administration of the public schools. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
4. Cohen, M. D., and March, J. G., Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.
5. Dreeben, R., The nature of teaching: Schools and the work of teachers. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1970.
6. Dubin, R., Organization fictions. In R. Dubin, Human relations in administration with readings (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1968.
7. Eliott, J. H., An exploratory study of relationships between administrative style used in the redress of governances and consequent parental support for the secondary school. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, forthcoming.
8. Erickson, D. A., Moral dilemmas of administrative powerlessness. Administrator's Notebook, 1972, 20 (8), 1-4.
9. Fullan, M., and Pomfret, A., Research on curriculum and instruction implementation. Review of Educational Research, 1977, 47, 335-397.
10. Geertz, C., The interpretations of cultures: Selected essays. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

11. Goffman, E., The presentation of self in everyday life. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959.

12. Haller, E. J., The questionnaire perspective in educational administration: Notes on the social context of method. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Minneapolis, 1970.

13. Jackson, P. W., Lonely at the top: Observations on the genesis of administrative isolation. Administrator's Notebook, 1976-77, 25 (9), 1-4.

14. James, H. T., Kelly, J. A., & Garms, W. I., The school budget process in large cities. In A. Rosenthal (Ed.), Governing education: A reader on politics, power, and public school policy. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1969.

15. Karabel, J. & Halsey, A. H., The new sociology of education. Theory and Society, 1976, 3, 529-552.

16. Keddie, N., Classroom knowledge. In M. F. D. Young (Ed.), Knowledge and control: New directions for the sociology of education. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971.

17. Kelly, G. A., The language of hypothesis: Man's psychological instrument. Journal of Individual Psychology, 1964, 20, 137-152.

18. Lortie, D. C., The balance of control and autonomy in elementary school teaching. In A. Etzioni (Ed.), The semi-professions and their organization: Teachers, nurses, social workers. New York: Free Press, 1969.

19. Manley-Casimir, M.E., The exercise of administrative discretion in secondary school discipline: Grounded hypotheses. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New York, 1977.

20. Mannheim, K., Essays on the sociology of knowledge. New York: Oxford University Press, 1952.

21. McGivney, J. H. & Moynihan, W., School and community. Teachers College Record, 1972, 74, 209-224.

22. Meyer, J. W. & Rowan, B., Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 1977, 83, 340-363.

23. Mintzberg, H., The nature of managerial work. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

24. Mitchell, W. C., Bargaining and public choice. In H. J. Leavitt & L. R. Pondy (Eds.), Readings in managerial psychology (2nd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1973.

25. Page, B. I., The theory of political ambiguity. American Political Science Review, 1976, 70, 742-752.

26. Pondy, L. R. & Mitroff, I. A., Beyond open systems models of organizations. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organziational behavior. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, in press.

27. Porter, D. O., Warner, D. C., & Porter, T. W., The politics of budgeting federal aid: Resource mobilization by local school districts. Sage Professional Papers in Administrative and Policy Studies, 1973, 1 (Series Number: 03-003).

28. Schön, D. A., Generative metaphor: A perspective on problem-setting in social policy. Paper presented at Metaphor and Thought: An Interdisciplinary Conference, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1977.

29. Smith, L. M. & Keith, P. M., Anatomy of educational innovation: An organizational analysis of an elementary school. New York: John Wiley, 1971.

30. Sorokin, P. A. & Merton, R. K., Social time: A methodological and functional analysis. American Journal of Sociology, 1937, 42, 615-629.

31. Walker, D. F., Toward comprehension of curricular realities. In L. S. Shulman (Ed.), Review of Research in Education, 4: 1976. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, 1977.

32. Walker, R., The sociology of education and life in school classrooms. International Review of Education, 1972, 18, 32-41.

33. Weick, K. E., The social psychology of organizing. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

The author wishes to acknowledge the insightful comments and critiques of J. Myron Atkin, Eric Bredo, Michael Cohen, Ernest House, Stanley Pogrow, Louis Pondy, Thomas Sergiovanni, Decker Walker and Ian Westbury. As they will discover on a careful re-reading, I tried to incorporate many of their good ideas. The end results, nonetheless, bears flaws for which I am solely responsible.

This work was developed under a contract from the National Institute of Education. However, opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of that agency, and no official endorsement should be inferred.